

Te



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,127	11/14/2001	Gyung-Yun Chwa	678-713 (P9688)	6212
28249	7590	07/27/2005	EXAMINER	
DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP 333 EARLE OVINGTON BLVD. UNIONDALE, NY 11553			BAYERL, RAYMOND J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,127

Applicant(s)

CHWA, GYUNG-YUN

Examiner

Raymond J. Bayerl

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 9 - 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 9 - 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2173

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 6, 9 – 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smethers ("Smethers"; US #6,560,640 B2) in view of Mintz ("Mintz"; US #6,250,930 B1).

As per independent claim 6, Smethers discloses a system that allows a user to bookmark web pages on a handheld device. The user programs the bookmarks manually and identifies a bookmark with a specific number. Thus, Smethers teaches "selecting one of a plurality of bookmarks, wherein each bookmark includes a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) field for saving an address of an Internet resource" (col. 3 lines 1-6 & col. 3 lines 34-44): selecting one of a plurality of bookmarks available to the wireless client device; transmitting a compact request for the document or file represented by the selected bookmark from the wireless client device to an intermediate server; obtaining, from the intermediate server, a universal resource locator for the document or file represented by the selected bookmark.

When a Smethers user has launched a bookmark, the bookmark has a identifier, the identifier is a button key, and when the key is pressed, it is used to point to the stored URL, which launches a document or file to be displayed to the browser.

The difference between the claims and Smethers is the claim recites the use of "a browser ID field for saving a browser ID used to select a corresponding

Art Unit: 2173

browser from the plurality of browsers" and "launching a browser of the plurality of browsers corresponding to the browser ID, the launched browser interpreting a URL of the selected bookmark, and accessing the Internet resource". Smethers has a single implied browser that is referenced by such URL names as

<http://www.uplanet.com/stocks.html> (see fig 4), but does not **explicitly** teach that a "plurality of browsers" may be referenced through such stored bookmark information.

However, Mintz teaches a system for allowing a user to view web-browsing information on the Internet on a single screen similar to that of Smethers. In addition, Mintz discloses "launching a browser of the plurality of browsers corresponding to the browser ID, the launched browser interpreting a URL of the selected bookmark, and accessing the Internet resource" (col. 7 lines 58-65) launching of multiple browsers that can be incorporated into a memo, message, survey, questionnaire or direct mail piece, all of which can be simultaneously displayed on a single screen. Currently, the e-Logic system permits about fifteen independent browsers to be simultaneously (rather than sequentially) displayed on a single screen (while about fifty browsers can be simultaneously displayed on multiple screens). This allows for the simultaneous search, viewing and transmittal of multiple search engines, multiple web sites, bookmarks or any combination thereof.

Mintz's multiple browsers can present a variety of forms of information—A variety of multimedia file formats may be embedded in an e-Logic mail message, these including Microsfot Word documents (*.doc), Microsoft Excel spreadsheets (*.xls), Microsoft Excel worksheets (*.xlw) and Powerpoint presentations (*.ppt) (col 5, lines 24 – 52). This means that the bookmarks that are used in Mintz will have to carry a “browser ID of a selected bookmark” in able to cause the content referenced to be properly presented. Typically, and as is suggested by Mintz, the file extension (e.g., (*.doc), (*.xls)) will signify to the rendering device just which “browser” should be employed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the launching of a browser as taught by Smethers to include a launch from a plurality of browsers as in Mintz, in order to obtain a system that allows the user to bookmark information of URL web pages and have a plurality of browsers to choose from in producing a more accurate and useful result. Motivation lies at least in Smethers, where the rendering of a bookmark is intended to give a user a useful result, and in the case of content encoded in a non-standard html format, Mintz's additional browsers would be needed.

As per claim 9, where “the browser ID field is 8 bits”, and claim 10, in which “the URL field is 64 bits”, it was notoriously well known in the art that a browser Id and Uniform Resource Locator field must contain some certain number of bits, and also that it was notoriously well known to employ power of two bit-multiples, such as 1, 2, 4, 8,

Art Unit: 2173

16, 32, 64, 128, etc. Please note, for example, that Smethers states that a Bookmark ID is preferably two bytes in size (col. 12 line 42; this meaning 16 bits).

The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of the ubiquity of power of two bit-multiples for encoding items in storage, and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the bit size of Smethers/Mintz to such standard values as are claimed. This permits the binary-operating computer system an optimum efficiency in handling the data for bookmarks as it is accessed.

As per claim 11, which recites, "the URL field is a string with null termination", it was also notoriously well known to one of the ordinary skill in the art that a URL field is a string with null termination, since the data of a URL is of a "string" format, and when it ends, a "null" is used as contrast to the main portion of the "string".

The examiner further takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that a "URL field" must end with a termination after a set of characters. It is important for strings to end with a termination, which can be any type of termination character, i.e. null sign, pound sign, or asterisk symbol, for the logic encoded in an information handling system, so that system is able to determine the ending of the set of characters in a string field. It would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the URL string of Smethers/Mintz to include a null character for a termination character, so that the information would be properly delimited for the purposes of storage and access in the bookmark system disclosed by both Smethers and Mintz.

Independent claim 12 focuses on “A bookmark frame generating method” of the kind that uses “a bookmark manager” to implement “a bookmark” via a “bookmark file” that contains the “browser” “ID” and “URL” as has been discussed above in reference to claim 6. However, the bookmarks of Smethers are authored manually by a user, and in Mintz, an entire e-Logic Authoring and Editing Engine is provided for this purpose (col 5, line 24 – col 6, line 7), so a “bookmark manager” that creates a “bookmark file” was also known in such art as Smethers and Mintz. In particular, Mintz suggests that a “selected browser” for an “Internet resource having the unique profile” is needed, as in the case of different formats of file content.

As per claim 13, Smethers in view of Mintz discloses the step of “inputting a bookmark name in the assigned bookmark file after the URL inputting step” (as at Smethers, col. 12 lines 5-10)—the Smethers system, for example, will use a number as a shorthand reference to a bookmark.

Independent claim 14 reiterates the claim 6 function, when its “program” will “launch the particular browser according to the browser ID” that is designated by the use of a “bookmark frame” that has “a URL field corresponding in 1:1 relation to the browser ID field”. However, and as has been noted above, the Smethers system of bookmark retention, where a “URL field” is retained to “access the Internet according to the URL”, would have obviously benefited from the kind of “browser ID”-specific functionality that is suggested by Mintz.

Art Unit: 2173

3. Applicant's arguments filed 11 May 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

At page 4 of the remarks, applicant argues that "Smethers does not teach or suggest an Internet terminal with a plurality of browsers", and while the Examiner agrees with this characterization of Smethers alone, it is still noted that Mintz remedies this lack by showing the use of A variety of multimedia file formats such as those that would employ a "browser ID" in the bookmark field such as a file extension that directs the rendering system to use the appropriate "browser" tool, as in Microsoft Word or Microsoft Excel, in addition to ordinary html and the incorporable .gif and .jpg components that appear inline.

Regarding Mintz, applicant merely states (page 4) that "Mintz does not cure the deficiencies of Smethers as Mintz does not teach or suggest selecting a bookmark that, in turn, selects a corresponding browser from the plurality of browsers, in addition to a corresponding URL". However, and as is noted above in the statement of rejection, the accessible objects whose URLs are specified in the plural-browser-implementing arrangement of Mintz will sometimes require browsers other than a standard Web browser or e-mail client, and thus Mintz suggests that the bookmarks contain the needed references to those browsers that will properly represent the indicated content. This will specify "the unique protocol belonging to the particular Internet resource", to answer applicant's subsequent argument on page 4 regarding claim 12, and it also answers applicant's argument for claim 14 on page 5—"Any bookmarks in Smethers or Mintz do not contain a browser ID *and* a URL".

Art Unit: 2173

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The additionally-cited US Patent documents (see attached form PTO-892) relate to applicant's topic of accessing URLs that have associated functions that need to be performed by a browser.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


6. In responding to this office action, please note that the examiner of record for the above identified application has changed. Any further inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond J. Bayerl whose telephone number is (571) 272-4045. The examiner can normally be reached on M - Th from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM ET.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached on (571) 272-4048. All patent application

Art Unit: 2173

related correspondence transmitted by FAX **must be directed** to the central FAX number (571) 273-8300.

8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.



RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

22 July 2005